From: Han, Terry@CDPH [Terry.Han@cdph.ca.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 10:35 AM

To: Praskins, Wayne [Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov]; Roddy, Elizabeth A CIV USN NAVFAC SW

SAN CA (USA) [elizabeth.roddy@navy.mil]

CC: Stoick, Paul T CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) [paul.stoick@navy.mil];

Robinson, Derek J CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) [derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil];

Bacey, Juanita@DTSC [Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov]

Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: Parcel G follow up questions/requests

Attachments: Parcel G November 2008.jpg; Parcel G TU 98 Zoomed In November 2008.jpg;

Parcel G TU 98 Width November 2008.jpg

Follow Up Flag: Follow up **Flag Status:** Completed

Thanks for Wayne re-starting the conversation about these topics. Please find my inputs (in Green) for some of the items below. Please also find the attached Google Earth aerial images related to item #3.

Thanks in advance and look forward to the discussion this afternoon!

Terry

From: Praskins, Wayne < Praskins. Wayne@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 9:10 AM

To: Roddy, Elizabeth A CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) <elizabeth.roddy@navy.mil>

Cc: Stoick, Paul T CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) paul.stoick@navy.mil>; Robinson, Derek J CIV USN

NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; Bacey, Juanita@DTSC <Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov>; Han, Terry@CDPH <Terry.Han@cdph.ca.gov>

Subject: Parcel G follow up questions/requests

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe. To report suspicious emails, click "Report Phish" button.

Liz -

Thank you for your responses. I have several follow up questions and requests:

1. How did such large pieces of debris end up in TU 99? Used as backfill? When my colleague visiting Parcel G last Thursday, he was told by APTIM that APTIM encountered bedrock at 11 ft below ground surface (bgs) in TU99 while Tetra Tech reported terminal excavation depth of 12 ft bgs. Did APTIM report such inconsistency between on-going excavation and past record to Navy?

2. Over the last several weeks we have discussed ways to verify that the TU boundaries have been correctly located. I have asked our in-house GIS group to compare the trench locations observable in historical aerial images to the locations that Aptim is currently excavating or plans

to excavate. (Many of the trenches are clearly visible in aerial images available on Google Earth starting in about 2007.) You mentioned previously that Aptim is using data files obtained from TT to locate the trenches. Can you provide a copy of the data file(s)? My GIS analyst says that his preference, if available, is to work with GIS shapefiles (.shp and accompanying files), geodatabase (.gdb) files containing relevant feature classes, and any accompanying or other relevant data.

3. We also plan to examine the historical aerial images to see whether asphalt or other hardscape was present at each TU when TT excavated. Where present, that may provide another way to verify TU boundaries.

I looked up the aerial images of Parcel G dated September 2008 using Google Earth Pro. According to Google Earth, the narrowest part of excavated TU98 in 2008 was 7 feet wide. In the aerial image of TU98, there were signs of side-wall cave-in during excavation in 2008, so I took the narrowest part of the open TU98 thinking that would be the trench width Tetra Tech planned initially. Does Navy have any record of the planned excavation width of TU98 in 2008? By comparing the actual width of TU98 in 2008 and the measurement from Google Earth, we can establish the accuracy of the distance measurement in Google Earth. At the same time, we can also determine the accuracy of distance measurement in Google Earth by comparing the distance between adjacent buildings measured in Google Earth and actual distance. With the accuracy of Google Earth aerial determined, the location of previous TU can be estimated and compared to the current excavation.

4. We also discussed whether differences in soil type or lithology have been observed between the ESU and SFU soils in a given trench. You have indicated that the Navy/Aptim has not observed differences in the trenches excavated to date. For the remining TUs, can Aptim provide photos from several locations in each TU comparing the ESU and SFU soil profiles? Alternatively, the EPA field representatives can work with Aptim to take the photos. That would probably require brief pauses in excavation to allow safe access.

Thanks.

Wayne Praskins | Superfund Project Manager U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9 75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-7-3) San Francisco, CA 94105 415-972-3181

From: Roddy, Elizabeth A CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) < elizabeth.roddy@navy.mil >

Sent: Wednesday, November 4, 2020 3:51 PM

To: Praskins, Wayne < Praskins, Wayne@epa.gov; Stoick, Paul T CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) < paul.stoick@navy.mil; Robinson, Derek J CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA)

<derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; Clancy, Maeve <Clancy.Maeve@epa.gov>; juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov;

Han, Terry@CDPH < terry.han@cdph.ca.gov **Subject:** RE: Parcel G Weekly Progress Report

Hi Wayne,

Responses to your questions are below.

Very Respectfully,

Liz Roddy Remedial Project Manager NAVFAC BRAC PMO West 33000 Nixie Way Bldg. 50, Floor 2 San Diego, CA 92147 (619) 524-5755 elizabeth.roddy@navy.mil

From: Praskins, Wayne < Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, November 3, 2020 5:53 PM

To: Roddy, Elizabeth A CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) <<u>elizabeth.roddy@navy.mil</u>>; Stoick, Paul T CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) <<u>paul.stoick@navy.mil</u>>; Robinson, Derek J CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN

CA (USA) < clancy, Maeve < claim.com/derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil;

juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov; Han, Terry@CDPH <terry.han@cdph.ca.gov>

Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: Parcel G Weekly Progress Report

Liz/Paul -

I have two questions we didn't have time to discuss in this afternoon's call:

1. Did you provide the agencies with the critical levels used to evaluate the Parcel G gamma scanning results? We discussed this topic last month. The Navy acknowledged the need to provide but I can't recall or locate a response.

RASO provided a few comments on the IL's and was out on leave all last week. Once I can confirm all comments have been addressed I will provide the IL's to the group. Thank you for your patience.

2. The attached photo shows what looks like large pieces of concrete debris. I understand the debris was excavated from the subsurface at TU99. Can you comment? Was the debris found in the ESU soils?

Debris continues to be segregated from the TU's soil as excavations continue at Parcel G. Segregated debris is 100% gamma scanned on an RSY Pad and alpha/beta loose surface contamination surveys are collected to support characterization of the material as LLRW or Non-LLRW. All debris will be handled under the waste management plan and disposed of properly (ie. The debris material will not be used in the backfill).

Wayne Praskins | Superfund Project Manager U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9 75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-7-3) San Francisco, CA 94105 415-972-3181

From: Roddy, Elizabeth A CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) <elizabeth.roddy@navy.mil>

Sent: Tuesday, November 3, 2020 11:55 AM

To: Stoick, Paul T CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) paul.stoick@navy.mil>; Robinson, Derek J CIV

USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) < derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil >; Praskins, Wayne

<<u>Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov</u>>; Clancy, Maeve <<u>Clancy.Maeve@epa.gov</u>>; juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov;

Han, Terry@CDPH < terry.han@cdph.ca.gov > Subject: Parcel G Weekly Progress Report

Good Afternoon,

Attached is the agenda for today's 1pm call.

Very Respectfully,

Liz Roddy Remedial Project Manager NAVFAC BRAC PMO West 33000 Nixie Way Bldg. 50, Floor 2 San Diego, CA 92147 (619) 524-5755 elizabeth.roddy@navy.mil